DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 029 CS 502 742

AUTHOR Lieb-Brilhart, Barbara
TITLE Oral Communication Instruction in the U.S.A.: Emerging Issues.
PUB DATE Jul 79
NOTE 22p.: Paper presented at the Conference on Developing Oral Communication Competence in Children (Armidale, Australia, July 12-18, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Communication Skills; Educational Assessment; Educational Theories; Elementary Secondary Education; Literature Reviews; Program Content; *Speech Communication; *Speech Instruction; Student Evaluation; *Teacher Evaluation; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This review of the status of speech instruction is divided into five parts, each addressing a separate issue. The first part describes the context for a change in approaches to communication instruction. The second part lists those ingredients essential to a good program, including the communication functions of controlling, feeling, informing, ritualizing, and imagining. The third part responds to the question of who should teach communication skills by defining five roles teachers play in the classroom and suggesting goals for teachers and students. To operationalize those goals, a checklist is offered for principals or other observers to describe teachers' communication behaviors. The fourth part describes an ideal oral communication program, and the fifth part suggests methods of assessing oral communication skills. (AEA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Barbara Lieb-Brilhart

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED180029

Oral Communication Instruction in the U.S.A.: Emerging Issues

Barbara Lieb-Brilhart

Issue 1: The Context for Change

The process of sharing ideas between Australians and Americans comes at a time of momentous change for both countries in approaches to communication instruction. Perhaps spurred by the Bullock Report[1], in conjunction with findings by researchers on communication development, we are coming to similar conclusions. Writers in both countries are emphasizing the need for holistic and integrated approaches to communication instruction, but most noteworthy is the recognition that speaking and listening skills play a vital role in the development of written language skills, mathematical skills, problem solving, and of course, in skills of personal development.

In response to persuasion from various segments of the education community to support programs which go beyond the focus on reading skills in isolation from other skills, the U.S. Congress, in 1978, amended the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to include a provision for Basic Skills and Educational Proficiency Programs. The description of basic skills to include "reading and mathematics and effective communication both written and oral," replaces the National Reading Act and reflects the growing recognition that the "basics" must include at a minimum those skills which require the management of symbols, both written and oral. The legislation comes at a time when American education is struggling with public demands for accountability and

CS502742

observable competencies for both teachers and learners. While these trends have sparked numerous controversies, I believe that they have produced very positive results for those of us interested in communication education. For in bring forced to determine what is basic, the evidence has impelled us, philosophically and legislatively, to conclude that oral communication instruction is critical in education.

Increasing evidence indicates that oral communication skills, especially those used in human interaction, are critical to the effective functioning of adults in career and social contexts. For example, the Endicott Report of 1978[2] described communication among the top three skills cited as important for success by managers in business, engineering and the arts. Other studies further support the need for such skills as effective speaking and conference leadership among top and middle management personnel.[3] Also relevant is a study of 2,543 adults, 40% of whom selected as their major fear that of "speaking before groups."[4]

However, despite the acknowledged centrality of communication to career and personal success, only a portion of American high school graduates have received formal instruction to develop effective oral communication skills. Recent data from the U.S. National Center for Educational Statistics indicate that, at best, only 65% of senior high schools offer identifiable speech communication courses. It is likely that few of these schools require speech courses for graduation, and it is difficult to ascertain the actual prevalence of speech in English courses. Unfortunately, speaking and listening skills have been taught predominately in the context of English electives, mainly for the "elite"

who already perform well in oral communication activities. At the elementary school level, such instruction is either fortuitous, contingent upon the teacher's training and interests, or is targeted for students with communication disorders in the context of special education.

Because of the notion that written literacy should be the primary goal of formal education, most students with so called normal speech development have received little formal training in speech communication after the age of 6. (As I have written elsewhere, the notion of literacy should be expanded to include the oral communication code.)[5] There is the persistent myth that because the written code is a new "language" that must be taught, and because most children already enter school using the oral code, there is, therefore, no need for further education in the skills of speaking and listening. Another persistent myth is that "anyone can teach speech." Thus, while there have always been qualified, certified speech teachers in many American high schools, speech education has often been the responsibility of teachers with little or no training in oral communication.

There are, of course, many programs in the United States at both the elementary and secondary levels where thriving oral communication programs are staffed with well trained personnel. As oral communication is identified among the basic skills and among state mandated minimal competencies, there are increasing demands for curricular resources, staff development programs and assessment models. Communication education professionals are attempting to respond to these needs in the context of current educational forces. Through projects

sponsored primarily by the Speech Communication Association (SCA), resources are now available on what should be taught, who should do the teaching, what communication programs should look like, and how skills ought to be assessed. While there are no definitive answers to all of these issues, there are some emerging viewpoints which I would like to summarize in this paper.

Issue 2: What Should Be Taught? -- The Functional Approach

The functional approach to communication instruction emerged from many research studies by linguists and communication specialists. In 1974, SCA sponsored a project on communication competencies which attempted to establish the status of our knowledge about communication development, and which summarized (from teachers' and children's viewpoints) those communication skills which are critical in social interactions. From this project and from other sources, we know that in the normal course of development adults develop a repertoire of communication responses which are appropriate to people, settings, tasks and topics involved in diverse communication contexts. But, we also know that where people have communication problems, they have often failed to develop repertoires of responses adequate for various communication contexts. The SCA project report[6] outlined goals for instruction leading to communication competence. These are based on the premise that in the course of development, individuals must learn to: 1) enlarge their repertoire of communication acts; 2) select criteria for making choices from the repertoire; 3) implement the communication acts chosen; and 4) evaluate the effectiveness of the communication employed.

The SCA National Competencies Project labelled five categories of communication functions which predominate in everyday life. The report emphasizes that, for the five categories, we are interested in the "interactive nature of the event."

> In a controlling context, we can be both controller and controlled. If we are being controlled, we need to be able to recognize the other's intention and its appropriateness to the particular content. We must also have a repertoire of behaviors that can confirm for the other that we recognize that intent and assent to it. In any communication context, we are both proactive and reactive.[7]

The report identified five categories of communication functions which predominate in everyday life. These are described in Figure 1 as the controlling, feeling, informing, ritualizing and imagining functions. Remembering that we may be senders and receivers in any one of these communication contexts (for example, in a context in which we are sharing feelings), we can plan instruction to facilitate development of students' repertoires within that category (for example, in the ability to share feelings).

At present, the SCA is distributing materials to help teachers implement instruction in the functional communication skill categories. National, regional and state workshops have already been implemented, and teachers are reporting success in using the learning activities related to the skill areas.[8]

In addition, another SCA task force reviewed state basic skill recommendations and job-related surveys and reported on the critical speaking and listening competencies needed by high school graduates.[9] Within the area of communication codes, minimal competencies are identified

as: listening effectively to spoken English, using words, pronounciation and grammar appropriate for the situation; using appropriate nonverbal signs; using the voice clearly. In the area of oral message evaluation, competencies are: identifying main ideas in messages; distinguishing facts from opinions; distinguishing between informative and persuasive messages; recognizing when another person does not understand your message. Basic communication skills are defined as the "process of selecting message elements and arranging them to produce spoken messages." Within this category, minimal competencies are identified as: expressing ideas clearly and concisely; expressing and defending with evidence your point of view; organizing messages so that others can understand them; asking questions to obtain information; answering questions effectively; giving concise and accurate directions; summarizing messages. In the area of human relations, minimal competencies are: describing another's point of view; describing differences in opinion; expressing feelings to others; performing social rituals.[10]

We should note that while these competencies are considered to be minimal, we have not, in the past, designed the formal instruction for achieving them with all students. We should underscore the fact that if oral communication instruction begins early and continues throughout the elementary and secondary education of an individual, these specifications of minimal competencies will likely become obsolete. For students should then be capable not only of performing a broad array of interactive communication behaviors, but many more will also be capable of understanding the complexities of verbal and nonverbal communication.

As we work within the context of the new basic skills legislation, we have the need for common models and definitions of oral communication for program planning. Recently the Speech Communication Association and the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association drafted a joint statement on Standards for Effective Oral Communication Programs[11] which included this definition:

> Oral Communication: the process of interacting through heard and spoken messages in a variety of situations.
>
> Effective oral communication is a learned behavior, involving the following processes:
>
> 1. Speaking in a variety of educational and social situations: Speaking involves, but is not limited to, arranging and producing messages through the use of voice, articulation, vocabulary, syntax and non-verbal cues (e.g., gesture, facial expression, vocal cues) appropriate to the speaker and listeners.
>
> 2. Listening in a variety of educational and social situations: Listening involves, but is not limited to, hearing, perceiving, discriminating, interpreting, synthesizing, evaluating, organizing and remembering information from verbal and non-verbal messages.

Since the foregoing definition is being distributed by the United States Office of Education in its packets for people preparing proposals for federal funding, it is likely to gain wide acceptance in the U.S. in a fairly short time.

Issue 3: Who Should Teach Communication Skills?

If we adopt a functional approach to communication instruction, what will be required of teachers? Both SCA and the American Speech-Hearing-Language Association have encouraged emphasis upon communication skills for all teachers. Likewise, colleges of education are beginning to offer (and some to require), pre-service and in-service courses in

communications skills for teachers. In other words, there is an intensified belief by U.S. educators that the teaching-learning process is essentially a communication process.

Recently, a joint task force of SCA and the American Theatre Association identified five roles that the teacher plays which are related to communication behaviors: 1) a model of behavior; 2) a facilitator of learning; 3) a resource person; 4) a participant in the profession, and 5) a change agent. Related to these roles are eight goals which teachers should achieve for themselves and with their students. These are:

1. Effective communication in a variety of contexts.
2. Aesthetic valuing and sensitive responses to artistic experience.
3. Accurate prediction of the consequences of communication decisions and behaviors.
4. Management of essential factors in communication situations, such as selection, development and presentation of ideas, strategies and media to influence human behavior.
5. Message evaluation on the basis of functional, ethical and aesthetic considerations.
6. Development of a personal communication style which can be appropriately adapted to a variety of communication concerns.
7. Participation in a democratic society (including freedom of artistic expression), through the development of specific skills and attitudes which promote free inquiry, critical listening, receptiveness toward divergent viewpoints, and willingness to support (functionally or artistically) an unpopular idea.
8. Facilitation of intercultural communication through increased sensitivity to similarities and differences among groups, through appropriate applications of the principles and processes of interpersonal communication, and through aesthetic values.[12]

To operationalize the foregoing goals, Figure 2 presents a checklist that principals or other observers might use to describe teachers' communication behaviors. Although the list is not a rating scale or evaluation device, it may help in pin-pointing topics for staff development.

In addition to developing communication skills for all teachers, we must also make sure that there are oral communication specialists at both the elementary and secondary school levels. At the elementary level, in addition to those teachers who identify and remediate communication disorders, we must also have specialists who can: 1) help teachers to strengthen students' communication skills by developing and demonstrating appropriate communication instruction; and 2) help teachers to solve communication problems, such as those in multicultural classrooms or those with mainstreamed special education pupils. At the secondary school level, we must develop and expand the number of existing specialists who can develop and implement speech communication, theatre and mass communication programs in educational and community settings. Once we understand that communication behavior is highly complex, we will realize that teachers must be specially trained to develop pupils' interactive skills. We would not assign the French teacher to teach math (unless he or she had been appropriately prepared); similarly, we should end the practice of assigning anyone with a free period (usually the physical education teacher), to teach speech communication.

I am well aware that the notion of specialists is a controversial one both in Australia and in the United States. Ideally, communication

instruction should occur in language arts, English or communication programs where written and oral language skills are developed in a holistic, integrated fashion. Unfortunately, teachers accustomed to focusing on instruction in literature and composition in isolation from oral communication skills, often have difficulty in perceiving the unique characteristics of the speech communication process. For example, they often perceive "integration" to mean merely the oral reading of a story or presentation of a book report. Until teachers are adequately prepared to understand the interactive nature of the speaking-listening process and are prepared to facilitate such instruction, we should opt for specialists who will devote their time to the development of oral communication skills for every student.

Issue 4: What are the Characteristics of the Ideal Oral Communication Program?

To assist the Office of Education in promoting characteristics of oral communication programs in basic skills instruction that would be acceptable to the communication profession, SCA and ASHA developed the Standards for Effective Oral Communication Programs, described earlier. As a principle writer of these standards, I can attest to the fact that many issues are yet to be resolved, particularly with respect to the role of oral communication in an integrated curriculum and in multi-cultural, multi-lingual classrooms. However, the standards do provide a framework from which to develop sound instructional programs and, I believe, offer us a firmer foundation than we previously had for program development.

The basic assumptions underlying effective oral communication

programs are stated, as follows, in the Standards:

1. Oral communication behaviors of students can be improved through direct instruction.

2. Oral communication instruction emphasizes the interactive nature of speaking and listening.

3. Oral communication instruction addresses the everyday communication needs of students and includes emphasis on the classroom as a practical communication environment.

4. There is a wide range of communication competence among speakers of the same language.

5. Communication competence is not dependent upon use of a particular form of language.

6. A primary goal of oral communication instruction is to increase the students' repertoire and use of effective speaking and listening behaviors.

7. Oral communication programs provide instruction based on a coordinated developmental continuum of skills, pre-school through adult.

8. Oral communication skills can be enhanced by using parents, supportive personnel, and appropriate instructional technology.

The standards list the following characteristics with respect to the teaching/learning process.

1. The oral communication program is based on current theory and research in speech and language development, psycholinguistics, rhetorical and communication theory, communication disorders, speech science, and related fields of study.

2. Oral communication instruction is a clearly identifiable part of the curriculum.

3. Oral communication instruction is systematically related to reading and writing instruction and to instruction in the various content areas.

4. The relevant academic, personal and social experiences of students provide core subject matter for the oral communication program.

5. Oral communication instruction provides a wide range of speaking and listening experiences, in order to develop effective communication skills appropriate to:

   a. a range of situations; e.g., informal to formal, interpersonal to mass communication.

   b. a range of purposes; e.g., informing, learning, persuading, evaluating messages, facilitating social interaction, sharing feelings, imaginative and creative expression.

   c. a range of audiences; e.g., classmates, teachers, peers, employers, family, community.

   d. a range of communication forms; e.g., conversation, group discussion, interview, drama, debate, public speaking, oral interpretation.

   e. a range of speaking styles; impromptu, extemporaneous, and reading from manuscript.

6. The oral communication program provides class time for systematic instruction in oral communication skills, e.g., critical listening, selecting, arranging and presenting messages, giving and receiving constructive feedback, nonverbal communication, etc.

7. The oral communication program includes development of adequate and appropriate language, articulation, voice, fluency and listening skills necessary for success in educational, career and social situations through regular classroom instruction, co-curricular activities, and speech-language pathology and audiology services.

8. Oral communication program instruction encourages and provides appropriate opportunities for the reticent student (e.g., one who is excessively fearful in speaking situations), to participate more effectively in oral communication.

Issue 5: How Should We Assess Oral Communication Skills?

Some educators are reluctant to include oral communication in their state basic skills plans for fear that there will be no way of assessing student behaviors. However, while oral communication behavior may be somewhat more difficult to assess than mathematical reasoning and reading comprehension, there have been some advances which can promote

sound assessment procedures.

First, it should be noted that many speech communication teachers have been very comfortable through the years with audience-based rating sheets and with other objectified indicators of pupils' communication effectiveness. Most speech teachers have strong notions of performance-based criteria for evaluating communication growth. In addition, certain American schools such as Westside High School in Omaha and those in the Gary, Indiana School District, are already engaged in proficiency testing for oral communication. Agencies such as the American College Testing Program and the National Assessment of Educational Progress are in the process of developing procedures for assessing speaking and listening skills. While no one of these assessment programs is adequate, we must remember that they have enjoyed less developmental support than have tests of reading, many of which are still being scrutinized and revised to parallel classroom practices and student behaviors. For immediate help in devising functional communication tests, one might review the book, Assessing Functional Communication by Larson, Backlund, Redmond and Barbour, which groups over 90 measures by function and age. While many of these are informal measures of communication behaviors, they might be suitable for classroom use or for the further development of performance-based school tests.

Currently the Educational Policies Board of the Speech Communication Association is directing a project to establish criteria for evaluating tests and procedures for assessing speaking and listening. After reviewing published and unpublished tests, the committee outlined the

following criteria:[14]

1. Stimulus materials should require the individual being tested to demonstrate skill as a speaker or listener.

2. Assessment instruments and procedures should clearly distinguish speaking and listening performance from reading and writing ability; i.e., inferences of speaking and listening competence should not be made from tests of reading and writing and directions and responses for a speaking and/or listening test should not be mediated through reading and writing modes/

3. Assessment instruments and procedures should be free of sexual, cultural, racial, ethnic content and/or stereotyping.

4. Assessment confirming the presence or absence of skills should not be confused with other testing to determine why individuals demonstrate or fail to demonstrate the skills.

5. Assessment should emphasize the application of speaking and listening in familiar situations; i.e., stimulus material should refer to the situations familiar to the individual being tested and responses should be evaluated for demonstration of skills rather than for accuracy of content.

6. Assessment should allow for various communication settings rather than be limited to one setting.

7. Assessment should involve situations that allow for a range of acceptable responses.

8. Assessment should demonstrate that outcomes are more than just chance evidence.

9. Assessment should provide results that are consistent with other evidence that might be available.

10. Assessment should have content validity.

11. Assessment procedures should be standardized and detailed enough so that student responses will not be dependent on the administrator's skills in administering the procedures.

12. Assessment procedures should be as free as possible of such negative outcomes as undue stress or anxiety.

13. Assessment procedures should be practical in terms of cost and time.

14. Assessment should involve simple equipment.

15. Assessment should be suitable for the individual to be tested.[14]

Space does not permit discussion of each of these items; hopefully such discussion can occur in the context of our conference.

Conclusions

To summarize what is happening in the United States with respect to oral communication instruction, we note the following trends and emerging issues:

1. In the context of the accountability and competency based education movement, oral communication education has been established as a bonefide component of basic skills education.

2. There is a growing awareness of the past inadequacies of the current educational systems to meet the needs of effective oral communication instruction.

3. Curricula at both the elementary and secondary levels are incorporating functional approaches to instruction, which emphasize the need to develop and to utilize a repertoire of communication acts.

4. While guidelines have been developed for instruction in minimal competencies in speaking and listening, the hope is that all students will eventually exceed minimal levels of performance.

5. New curriculum models depict oral communication as an interactive process, involving both verbal and non-verbal codes.

6. All teachers should demonstrate effective communication skills, but there should also be communication specialists at the elementary and secondary levels to promote effective programs.

7. Standards for effective oral communication programs provide for systematic instruction, with a wide variety of experiences, in a well defined portion of the curriculum, by competent personnel.

8. Assessment procedures are advocated to depict the unique characteristics of the oral communication process in a wide variety of settings.

In closing, we should note that we have now come full circle in the United States with respect to oral communication instruction. Early in its history, American education continued its British roots with speech communication at the heart of basic education. There were peaks and valleys in its emphasis, but by 1938, speech was firmly entrenched in the curriculum.[15] Our subsequent overemphasis on literature in English departments, our fragmentation of the communication professions, and our recent futile attempts to teach written communication in isolation from spoken communication skills, have all contributed to the de-emphasis on oral communication instruction. The 1978 Basic Skills legislation, with its inclusion of oral communication, is but a small beginning in restoring balance to the communication curriculum. At least, it holds out some promise to our citizens who too often lack the formal oral communication education necessary for academic, social and career success.

FIVE COMMUNICATION FUNCTIONS:

1. CONTROLLING. Communication acts in which the participants' dominant function is to control behavior: for example, commanding, offering, suggesting, permitting, threatening, warning, prohibiting, contracting, refusing, bargaining, rejecting, acknowledging, justifying, persuading, and arguing.

2. FEELING. Communication acts which express and respond to feelings and attitudes such as exclaiming, expressing a state or an attitude, taunting, commiserating, tale-telling, blaming, disagreeing, and rejecting.

3. INFOPMING. Communication acts in which the participants' function is to offer or seek information: for example, stating information, questioning, answering, justifying, naming, pointing out an object, demonstrating, explaining, and acknowledging.

4. RITUALIZING. Communication acts which serve primarily to maintain social relationships and to facilitate social interaction, such as greeting, taking leave, participating in verbal games (pat-a-cake), reciting, taking turns in conversations, participating in culturally appropriate speech modes (for example, teasing, praying, punning, playing the dozens), and demonstrating culturally appropriate amenities.

5. IMAGINING. Communication acts which cast the participants in imaginary situations and include creative behaviors such as role playing, fantasizing, speculating, dramatizing, theorizing, and storytelling.

Figure 1. A summary of the five functional communication categories from the Report of the Speech Communication Association's National Project on Speech Communication Competencies.

I. Is the teacher's message governed by a clear purpose?

A. Can the teacher write or say what should happen as a result of a presentation, a pupil or parent conference, a proposal to the principal, etc.?

B. Does the teacher seek "feedback" to determine how well the purpose was accomplished (e.g., through questions, observable products, etc.)?

C. Does the teacher "revise" messages to accomplish the purpose?

II. Does the teacher adapt messages to the communication context?

A. Does the teacher emphasize a "critical message" or "organizing principle" for listeners to remember?

B. Does the teacher structure ideas to be easily understood and remembered?

C. Are the ideas adapted to the experiences of the listeners (e.g., age, abilities, knowledge, etc.)?

D. Does the teacher use verbal language (e.g., examples, analogies, stories) to help make ideas concrete and familiar?

E. Does the teacher use non-verbal language (e.g., gestures, facial expression, voice, space, touch, taste, media, etc.) to help make ideas concrete and familiar?

III. Can the teacher manage a variety of communication processes:

A. With respect to communication contexts: one-to-one, small group, one-to-group and mass communication contexts?

B. With respect to strategies and formats (e.g., problem-solving models, questioning, learning discussions, role playing, conflict resolution, etc.)?

C. With respect to non-verbal factors (e.g., use of media; use of environmental factors such as color, space, light, temperature; use of voice and bodily movement, etc.)?

IV. Is the teacher an effective listener?

A. Does the teacher listen to improve human relationships by:

1. being "open" to "feedback" from others?

2. being persuaded more by <u>what</u> is said than by <u>how</u> it is said?

3. "mirroring" feelings and "restating" messages whenever feasible?

4. accepting original responses of others?

B. Does the teacher evaluate messages on the basis of appropriate criteria, e.g.:

1. functional considerations: did the message accomplish its purpose?

2. ethical considerations: were the sources accurate, credible, logical, etc?

3. aesthetic considerations: what techniques were used by the speaker, dramatist, reader, etc.?

V. Does the teacher establish a positive communication climate?

A. Does the teacher relate concepts to the listeners' needs and motives?

B. Does the teacher communicate trust, support, empathy, etc.?

C. Is the teacher receptive toward the viewpoints and artistic products of other cultures?

HOW WELL DO YOUR TEACHERS FOSTER GOOD COMMUNICATION IN STUDENTS

I. Does the teacher view pupil communication abilities from a developmental perspective with respect to:

1. influences of family, peer and mass media?

2. functions such as: informing, controlling, feeling, imagining, ritualizing?

3. interrelationships among reading, writing, speaking and listening?

4. pupil problems in verbal and non-verbal communication?

II. Does the teacher help students to develop communication competencies by:

A. Emphasizing principles of listening in interactive and public communication contexts (e.g., in discussions, when viewing T.V., etc.)?

B. Providing opportunities for students to achieve various communication goals (e.g., through speaking to inform, persuade, discuss, solve problems, etc.)?

C. Using speaking and listening to stimulate creative processes (e.g., through creative dramatics, story telling, discussion of artistic products, etc.)?

D. Encouraging acceptance of differences in viewpoints and communication styles?

Figure 2. A checklist of teacher's communication skills, Adapted [illegible]bara Lieb-Brilhart from Preparation of Elementary and Secon[illegible]eachers in Speech Communication and Theatre, published by the [illegible]ican Theatre Association and the Speech Communication Association, 1978.

Footnotes

1. A Language for Life: Report of the Committee of Inquiry Appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science under the Chairmanship of Sir Alan Bullock, FBA, 1975, H.M.S.

2. 1978 Endicott Report: 32nd Annual Survey of Well Known Business and Industrial Firms Concerning Employment Trends for College Graduates, Frank S. Endicott (retired Placement Director, Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois)

3. James H. McBath and David R. Burhans, Communication Education for Careers, prepared under the auspices of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, available from Speech Communication Association, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, Virginia 22041, 1975.

4. R.H. Bruskin Associates, "What Are Americans Afraid Of?" The Bruskin Report, 1973, no. 53.

5. Barbara Lieb-Brilhart, "What if Johnny Could Read and Write?... Another Look at the Literacy Issue," Communication Education, Vol. 26, September, 1977, pp. 251-253.

6. R.R. Allen and Kenneth L. Brown, editors, Developing Communication Competence in Children: A Report of the Speech Communication Association's National Project on Speech Communication Competencies, Skokie, Illinois: National Textbook Co., 1976.

7. Ibid, p. 251.

8. See, for example, two ERIC/RCS booklets available from the Speech Communication Association which describe learning activities related to the functional categories:

> Barbara S. Wood, editor, Development of Functional Communication Competencies: Pre-K - Grade 6, 1977.
>
> Barbara S. Wood, editor, Development of Functional Communication Competencies: Grades 7-12, 1977.

9. Ronald E. Bassett, Nilwon Whittington, Ann Staton-Spicer, "The Basics in Speaking and Listening for High School Graduates: What Should be Assessed?" Communication Education, vol. 27, November 1978, pp. 293-303.

10. The minimal competencies and related sample behaviors are available in brochure form as SCA Guidelines for Minimal Competencies in Speaking and Listening for High School Graduates from the Speech Communication Association, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, Virginia 22041 (single copies free), 1978.

11. Standards for Effective Oral Communication Programs, prepared by American Speech-Language-Hearing Association and Speech Communication Association, published in SPECTRA, a newsletter of Speech Communication Association, June 1979, p. 8.

12. Preparation of Elementary and Secondary Teachers in Speech Communication and Theatre, published by the American Theatre Association (1029 Vermont Avenue M.W., Washington, D.C. 20005) and the Speech Communication Association (5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, Virginia 22041), 1978.

13. Carl Larson, Phil Backlund, Mark Redmond, Alton Barbour, Assessing Functional Communication, prepared under the auspices of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, available from Speech Communication Association, 5205 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, Virginia 22041, 1978.

14. These standards are awaiting formal approval by SCA and should be viewed as a draft by an EPB Subcommittee.

15. For an historical account of speech education in the United States, see: Karl Wallace, editor, History of Speech Education in America, prepared under the auspices of the Speech Communication Association (formerly Speech Association of America), New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954.